

Legal Services Board's proposed policy statement 'Encouraging a diverse legal profession': SRA Consultation Response

2 March 2026

Introduction

1. The Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) is the largest regulator of legal services in England and Wales, regulating solicitors and law firms. Our purpose is to drive confidence and trust in legal services. We work to protect members of the public and support the rule of law and the administration of justice. We focus on the issues that can transform legal services, making sure the profession delivers the high standard of service that the public deserves.
2. We warmly welcome the Legal Services Board's (LSB's) commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in the sector and share its ambition for 'an equal, diverse and inclusive legal profession that delivers effectively for consumers and in the public interest'. A clear and aspirational vision for EDI sends a strong message about the importance and value of equality, diversity and inclusion across the legal services sector. Visible and active leadership on EDI is critical to driving positive change.
3. To achieve this vision, the LSB has set out four outcomes that it is proposed frontline legal services regulators should meet. These are that regulators:
 - take strategic, evidence-based and collaborative actions to encourage a diverse legal profession
 - take effective steps to ensure regulatory approaches, processes and decision-making support equality and fairness and do not undermine efforts to encourage a diverse profession
 - support fair, flexible, and accessible pathways into, within and back into the professions that encourage a diverse legal profession
 - ensure their frameworks effectively support authorised persons to uphold professional conduct, behaviours, and competencies that encourage a diverse legal profession.
4. Ensuring an effective and impactful approach to EDI and championing EDI in the solicitors' profession has long been part of the SRA's work programme, in line with our regulatory objective. Our work here includes both how we regulate and our approach as an inclusive employer of a diverse workforce. We see both these two elements as equally necessary and mutually reinforcing. We support the LSB's four proposed outcomes and appreciate the amount of work and research that has gone into developing the consultation.
5. We have been working in a proportionate and co-operative way with law firms on EDI, including the collection of diversity data, for more than ten years. Having good quality data about diversity in the profession helps the SRA, firms,

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

professional bodies and others to understand and address any challenges in achieving a diverse and inclusive legal workforce. We use this data to inform our regulatory approach and the work we do to encourage EDI in the profession. It allows us to monitor progress and informs research and publications produced by us and others.

6. We will shortly be publishing the findings from our most recent data, collected in 2025 from 99.5% of law firms, covering more than 225,000 people working in 8,876 firms. This will include a new tool to show diversity trends over ten years, from 2015 to 2025. The data shows there has been an overall increase in diversity in law firms over this time, in particular:
 - an increase of women solicitors, including at senior levels
 - an increase in the overall proportion of solicitors from minority ethnic groups
 - a steady increase in the proportion of disabled solicitors.
7. Despite these positive trends, we recognise there is more to do to deliver a diverse and inclusive profession. This includes addressing the seniority gap which remains for women and minority ethnic groups in the largest firms, the continued underrepresentation of disabled solicitors (compared to the national population) and encouraging socio-economic diversity in the profession.
8. Achieving the LSB's vision will undoubtedly require sustained and clear-sighted action from the SRA, other legal regulators, legal firms and a wide range of other stakeholders in the legal sector and beyond. The sector will need to work collaboratively with regulators, including the SRA, the LSB and others, in tackling the barriers to diversity, recognising that many of the challenges to meeting this vision are rooted in wider societal factors and disparities¹.
9. To deliver the vision for diversity over the next decade in an ever-changing environment will require a flexible, outcomes-focused approach. The approach mandated by the LSB for all front-line regulators will need to be proportionate and deliverable by a wide range of different-sized regulators working across different legal professions with different profiles and different regulatory frameworks.
10. Whatever framework the LSB sets out, will need to support and enable each regulator to assess the challenges and opportunities that are unique to its sphere of operation. This will drive the most effective and impactful approach to EDI within its particular context. We see front-line regulators as being best placed to determine how they can drive change in their professions, as the experts in their fields, with access to the relevant data and evidence.

¹ See for example, the findings from our research: [SRA | Potential causes of differential outcomes by ethnicity in legal professional assessments | Solicitors Regulation Authority](#)

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

11. We would therefore support the LSB taking an outcomes-focused, rather than a prescriptive, approach to its regulation in relation to EDI. This would be in line with regulatory good practice and the need to be proportionate, as set out in the better regulation principles². This approach is also in line with the principle set out in [section 28 of the Legal Services Act 2007](#), that each approved regulator must act in a way which it considers to be the most appropriate for the purpose of meeting its regulatory objectives.
12. A key risk in taking a more prescriptive approach is driving regulators to focus on delivering detailed requirements, rather than achieving the desired EDI outcomes. We have highlighted in this response, where core expectations could be framed in a more outcomes-focused way, with enhanced expectations as supporting guidance.
13. One risk we wish to highlight, is the potential impact of core expectation VII of Outcome 4. If this proposal were taken forward, it would require the SRA to introduce a new regulatory requirement on law firms to identify and implement strategic actions to tackle diversity, wellbeing and conduct challenges, and be in a position to report these to us when required.
14. Encouraging diversity and inclusive behaviours within firms is undoubtedly a core priority, and there is more that we, and others, can do to address some of the barriers to diversity and inclusion which exist in law firms. As we develop our EDI strategy and evaluation framework, we will be considering the available data and evidence before identifying the most effective approach. We have seen some success with our collaborative approach, encouraging positive engagement, buy-in and trust within the profession. We think it is important that the most appropriate approach is identified for the solicitors' profession, and we think we are well placed to determine this. There needs to be flexibility to allow us to do that, and we are concerned that requiring us to impose a specific regulatory requirement under expectation VII may not lead to the most impactful approach to drive good EDI outcomes.
15. Before introducing any such requirement, we would advise carrying out a regulatory impact assessment and detailed engagement with law firms to determine possible impacts on the market, including in relation to growth and competitiveness. Small and medium-sized firms are most likely to feel any increased regulatory burden, cost and potential impact on their economic competitiveness. There could also be an adverse equality impact on sole practices and small firms, which are more likely to be run by Black, Asian or minority ethnic solicitors. Our preference would be for the LSB to take an outcomes-focused approach in this regard, rather than setting a requirement that 'must' be met. This would support regulators to consider all the options

² [Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 - Explanatory Notes](#)

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

available to driving EDI in the most effective way. We would welcome further collaboration with the LSB and other regulators to explore the possible approaches and options in this regard.

16. We note and welcome the LSB's reference in the consultation to allowing regulators discretion to take alternative approaches to those set out within the core expectations. This requires 'clear evidence and reasons for why their proposed alternatives are more appropriate' which suggests any deviation from the prescribed approach should be the exception rather than the rule. All core outcomes are described as requirements that regulators '**must**' meet. We would welcome a reconsideration of the language of the requirements to support a more outcomes-focused approach. This would allow regulators to determine the most impactful approaches to drive real change and improvements in EDI in their context.

Our response

Outcomes and expectations

Q1a. Do you agree that these proposed outcomes will help to address the barriers to encouraging a diverse legal profession? Are there any further, or alternative, outcomes we should consider?

17. We agree with the proposed outcomes which encourage an evidence based and strategic approach (Outcome 1) and support collaboration. The outcomes cover key barriers to diversity across the sector, including access to the profession (Outcome 3), the need for high ethical standards and behaviours and the need to challenge counter inclusive conduct (Outcome 4). The outcomes also support regulators in fulfilling our public sector equality duty by emphasising the importance of assessing the equality impact of our regulatory work and making sure our approach to discipline and enforcement is fair (Outcome 2).

Q1b. Do you agree that the proposed outcomes should be pursued by regulators through a set of specific expectations?

Q1c. Do you agree that the proposed structure of core and enhanced expectations under the general outcomes offers an effective way to set a clear minimum standard for all regulators, while also encouraging regulators to consider additional steps, where appropriate?

18. It is helpful for frontline legal regulators to have a clear understanding of the LSB's expectations in relation to each of the outcomes. The setting of core expectations can support this, where these are formulated to focus on outcomes.
19. Framing the enhanced expectations (and some of the prescription and footnotes included in the core expectations) as guidance for legal regulators could be a more effective approach to fostering a culture of continuous improvement, whilst at the same time, providing flexibility for regulators to adapt to a changing environment where new risks emerge. Such an approach could also avoid scenarios in which regulators lack clarity over which expectations apply to them at any one point in time.

Outcome 1 - Regulators take strategic, evidence-based and collaborative actions to encourage a diverse legal profession

Q2a. Do you agree with the proposed Outcome 1?

Q2b. Do you agree that the proposed expectations will help regulators to pursue Outcome 1? Are there any further expectations beyond those we have included that would support regulators to pursue this outcome?

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

Q2c. Are there any enhanced expectations that would be better placed under core expectations under Outcome 1? Are there any core expectations that would be better placed under enhanced expectations under Outcome 1?

20. We support proposed Outcome 1. An evidence-based approach which includes a shared understanding of diversity in the sector, is critical in determining where regulators and key stakeholders should focus efforts to maximise beneficial outcomes.
21. Core expectation I relates to diversity monitoring. We have been collecting diversity data for over ten years and believe this is a necessary prerequisite to understanding and addressing barriers. We work closely with other legal regulators to discuss (and where possible and appropriate to align) our approach to diversity monitoring across the sector. We also ensure our approach to data collection aligns with [Office for National Statistics standards and norms](#) which evolve over time. We tailor our approach to the particular circumstances relevant to our regulated populations and maximise disclosure rates. The wording of core expectation I is clear and outcomes-focused, allowing regulators to collect data in a way that is most effective for the profession they regulate. However, the detailed footnotes add a layer of prescription in relation to how data is collected, used and combined (footnotes 9,11 and 13). We would suggest these notes be expressed as guidance.
22. Core expectation II covers the additional steps the LSB expects regulators to take to identify barriers and opportunities to encourage diversity in the profession. It will be important to maintain a level of openness to the different ways that regulators may fulfil this expectation, which may be different for each of the different regulators. For example, the SRA collects additional evidence about EDI in the solicitors' profession through a variety of means and such approaches may change over time. This includes formal research commissioned from academics and others, engagement with law firms and other groups, thematic reviews and horizon scanning. Where appropriate, we share this insight with stakeholders and with the other legal regulators using our Legal Regulators EDI Forum. We benefit from the insight provided by this engagement, including the insight gained from the research and experiences of other legal regulators.
23. In line with core expectation III, we see the value in developing a more strategic approach to EDI and have already made a commitment in our current Corporate Strategy to develop an EDI evaluation framework. As part of this, we will be developing an EDI strategy and action plan based on a theory of change approach. Although the LSB's proposals broadly align with our plans, this is one of the areas where the expectations (both core and enhanced) are prescriptive. These include prescribing regulators' approach to governance and reporting, including in relation to resources skills and training and how

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

regulators should involve the profession and others and what is disseminated from the work involved.

24. We would suggest that the level of prescription here does not allow sufficient flexibility for regulators given the context within which each regulator is working. For example, for the SRA it would be likely to mean we would have to develop governance, oversight and reporting arrangements for EDI which are separate to the way we manage our other strategic priorities. We believe that it is more effective for regulators to ensure EDI governance is aligned and built into existing corporate governance arrangements in a way that works most effectively for each regulator. Regulators are best placed to determine the arrangements they make to align and build EDI into their other corporate priorities.

Outcome 2 - Regulators take effective steps to ensure regulatory approaches, processes and decision-making support equality and fairness and do not undermine efforts to encourage a diverse profession

Q3a. Do you agree with the proposed Outcome 2?

Q3b. Do you agree that the proposed expectations will help regulators to pursue Outcome 2? Are there any further expectations beyond those we have included that would support regulators to pursue this outcome?

Q3c. Are there any enhanced expectations we could set for regulators to pursue Outcome 2?

25. We support proposed Outcome 2. Core expectations I and II require regulators to carry out equality impact assessments (EIAs) and share the results with stakeholders when consulting on regulatory policy. Carrying out and consulting on EIAs is fundamental to effective policy development and we routinely publish EIAs alongside our consultations. Equality impact assessments are a core and valuable tool and help us meet our public sector equality duty (s.149 of the Equality Act 2010).
26. The LSB's consultation proposes that in addition to considering the relevant protected characteristics, regulators should be required to consider the impact of socio-economic background within EIAs. This is in line with current requirements in Wales and [proposals currently being considered by the government](#). We agree that this is an important characteristic and already collect data on socio-economic background from the profession and from candidates taking the Solicitors Qualification Examination (SQE).
27. We agree with core expectation III that regulators should take steps to effectively support fair disciplinary and enforcement processes. While the SRA does not have any control over decisions taken by the independent Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) which is responsible for disciplinary decisions in

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

certain cases, we do have a range of measures in place to support fair decision making in our own disciplinary and enforcement processes. In our view, a broad, outcomes-focused expectation would be more effective here. For example, there is a significant amount of detail in core expectation III, in particular sub paragraph (a) and its footnotes, about the type of training it suggests regulators should or could provide to support decision making and to whom this should be delivered. We fully agree that high-quality training of decision-makers is important and have provided training similar to that described by the LSB. Regulators will be best placed to determine the type of training required to support decision making, as well as other measures, considering the environment within which each regulator operates.

28. Whilst the suggestions about training included by the LSB may be helpful, including them as footnotes to core outcomes, suggests the LSB sees them as a core requirement. This could lead regulators to take a rigid approach to training and may discourage a broader more outcomes-focused approach. We would therefore suggest that the current detail about the type of training is included as guidance rather than footnoted within the core requirements. Regulators will of course also have other important measures in place to promote fairness, for example: transparent decision-making criteria, fair processes including the right of review or appeal, and effective complaints procedures.
29. We recognise the importance of monitoring individuals in our disciplinary and enforcement processes by diversity characteristics, addressed in core expectation III (b). We publish an annual report of our analysis and also commissioned research to help us better understand the overrepresentation that we see for some groups. Our research has shown that the causes of overrepresentation are complex and there is no simple solution, but we are implementing commitments we made based on the findings of the report.
30. In relation to core expectation III (d), we agree that it is important to appropriately support the wellbeing of people involved in our enforcement processes. We have measures in place and recognise it can be stressful for those being investigated as well as for those making complaints or giving evidence.

Outcome 3 – Regulators support fair, flexible, and accessible pathways into, within and back into the professions that encourage a diverse legal profession

Q4a. Do you agree with the proposed Outcome 3?

Q4b. Do you agree that the proposed expectations will help regulators to pursue Outcome 3? Are there any further expectations beyond those we have included that would support regulators to pursue this outcome?

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

Q4c. Are there any enhanced expectations that would be better placed under core expectations under Outcome 3? Are there any core expectations that would be better placed under enhanced expectations under Outcome 3?

Q4d. Are there any additional expectations, either core or enhanced, we should set under Outcome 3 to reduce barriers faced by authorised persons when moving between and/or re-entering the professions (e.g., following a prolonged absence from practice for health, caring or other reasons)?

31. We support proposed Outcome 3. The core expectations broadly align with our approach to supporting fair and flexible pathways into the profession. We welcome the flexibility built into the drafting here, which recognises that not all regulators (including the SRA) have oversight of training or training providers.
32. We are committed to publishing information which supports the choices to be made by aspiring solicitors and encourages a healthy training market. We and Kaplan, the provider of the Solicitors Qualification Examination (SQE), publish a wealth of information for prospective SQE candidates. This includes a new search tool for candidates to review the courses which training providers have advised us are available.
33. Under core expectation III, the LSB sets out a prescriptive list of information which should be published, including training costs and outcomes. We have thought very carefully about the benefits and risks of publishing outcomes by training course and published a [statement setting out our position](#) on this in December 2025. We would encourage the LSB to set less prescriptive requirements on what must be published, to allow regulators to manage these risks carefully. This is an example of where we see regulators as best placed to determine, in all the circumstances, the best approach to meet the intended outcome.

Outcome 4 - Regulators ensure their frameworks effectively support authorised persons to uphold professional conduct, behaviours, and competencies that encourage a diverse legal profession

Q5a. Do you agree with the proposed Outcome 4?

Q5b. Do you agree that the proposed expectations will help regulators to pursue Outcome 4? Are there any further expectations beyond those we have included that would support regulators to pursue this outcome?

Q5c. Are there any enhanced expectations that would be better placed under core expectations under Outcome 4? Are there any core expectations that would be better placed under enhanced expectations under Outcome 4?

34. We support proposed Outcome 4. In relation to core expectations I to III, we have introduced into our Codes, a requirement for regulated law firms and

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

individuals to treat people fairly. We require firms to challenge behaviours which do not meet this standard and have published guidance and further resources to help the profession understand our expectations. We take steps to 'appropriately monitor' the impact of our fair treatment standards and track the incidence of reports we receive about them.

35. In relation to core expectation IV, we have clear and accessible routes for people to report concerns to us, and solicitors can also contact our Ethics advice team. We also make it clear in our guidance that we expect law firms to provide a safe environment for people to raise concerns. In addition, amendments are being made to the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, to designate the SRA as a prescribed person in the Act, currently due to come into force in June 2026.
36. Core expectation V covers competence frameworks and VI requires additional competence standards for managers³. In relation to core expectation VI, our view and our experience is that there should not be different competence standards for different roles in relation to EDI. The core competences that are required to perform effectively as a solicitor should be common to all solicitors, as all solicitors have a role to play in encouraging EDI, not just managers.
37. Our approach, which sets a single set of competence standards which cover EDI, already recognises that requirements and expectations will change depending on job role and context. We think our approach is clear and provides flexibility for individual solicitors to determine for themselves how the competences apply in their own context. Having two sets of separate requirements may present practical compliance challenges for both firms and professionals, for example, where individuals move roles, or take on flexible, short-term supervisory responsibilities.
38. Our regulatory framework requires that law firms have systems, processes, and training in place to make sure they (and their staff) are managing their responsibilities to encourage EDI appropriately⁴. Our framework focuses on managing individual behaviours as well as setting expectations for firms in this regard. We believe this is a more effective, more practical and less burdensome approach within our professional context, than requiring a

³ We have also noted there is reference in the consultation document to an expectation that regulators require "mandatory training on professional standards, including fair treatment and respect for all colleagues" which is not reflected in the proposed policy statement in annex A. We are assuming that the version set out in the proposed policy statement is the correct one.

⁴ See para 4.3 in our [Code of Conduct for firms](#) which requires firms to 'ensure that your [managers](#) and employees are competent to carry out their role, and keep their professional knowledge and skills, as well as understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations, up to date.'

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

separate set of competence standards for managers as proposed in the present consultation.

39. In relation to core expectation VII, we agree that encouraging diversity and inclusive behaviours within firms is a core priority, and there is more that we, and others, can do, to address some of the barriers which exist in law firms. However, we would highlight risks relating both to the potential impact and the potential effectiveness of this expectation. This expectation would require (appropriate) regulators to 'set a requirement for authorised firms to have a clear understanding of the diversity profile of their workforce (at all career stages), to have a thorough understanding of wellbeing and conduct challenges, and to take remedial action to address any evidenced disparities, reporting data and plans on these to the regulator on request'.
40. The firms we regulate will already have the ability to understand the diversity profile of their workforce, as we require them to collect this data every two years and report it to us in order to build an accurate profile of diversity across all law firms. We have worked with the profession to help embed this requirement, taking a careful and proportionate approach. We were able to justify the prescriptive approach here, to ensure we could use the data to build a diversity profile across all law firms. But we recognise it is a burden on law firms, and as a result of feedback from small firms we moved collection from every year to every two years.
41. We have commented in our introduction about the potential discretion for regulators in relation to the mandatory core outcomes. We believe the LSB's proposal in core expectation VII would effectively require us to introduce new rules to require all law firms to additionally: (a) have a thorough understanding of wellbeing and conduct challenges, (b) take remedial action to address any evidenced disparities, and (c) report data and plans on these to the regulator on request.
42. The regulatory burden and potential cost of meeting this requirement could have a significant impact on law firms, in particular small and mid-size firms. And a potential equality impact on sole practitioners and small firms which are more likely to be run by Black, Asian or minority ethnic solicitors. It will be important to engage with law firms about this proposal and carry out a regulatory impact assessment before a final decision is made. This will help determine if the proposed approach is proportionate and likely to have the intended effect. There is a risk, particularly if this is seen as overly burdensome, that a 'tick-box' approach may be taken to EDI, rather than an approach founded on evidence and commitment to lasting change. Such further engagement and analysis would be helpful to explore further whether the proposed approach would be the most effective means of reaching our shared vision for a diverse profession.

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

43. From our engagement with larger firms, we are aware that many already have a good understanding of the diversity profile of their workforce at all levels and actively pursue a strategic action plan to address the gaps. There have been some improvements in these firms over time, as evidenced in our diversity data collection. However, challenges within these larger firms remain, including the slow pace of change in relation to the representation of women and Black, Asian and minority ethnic solicitors at the most senior levels. It is not clear whether imposing an additional regulatory requirement on such firms (to do what many are already doing) would make a significant difference in the outcomes they have been able to achieve to date.
44. Our current approach is to use the full range of regulatory levers available to us in a proportionate way. We take regulatory action when firms fail to collect and report diversity data to us, imposing fixed financial penalties on firms which are non-compliant. We monitor compliance with our requirement that firms publish a summary of their workforce diversity data, contacting non-compliant firms to remind them of their obligations. We use a range of softer powers to influence behaviours, including engagement, thematic reviews, and providing guidance and resources to share best practice. We agree that we should always challenge ourselves to do more to hold law firms to account. As we develop our EDI strategy and evaluation framework, we will be considering the available data and evidence before identifying the most effective approach. We would suggest that further consideration is needed before introducing a 'one-size-fits-all' requirement on law firms as proposed in the present consultation.
45. In relation to expectation VIII, we agree that it is important to encourage and support firms to advance EDI. Our outcomes-focused approach means we do not prescribe particular workplace policies and processes for law firms, but we do provide guidance and resources to help law firms meet our requirements. There are others who may have a role in this, including the Law Society and potentially other organisations such as the Equality and Human Rights Commission and ACAS. We note the potential overlap between this expectation and core expectation III (to provide guidance to solicitors and law firms to encourage compliance with fair treatment requirements). It may be possible to combine these expectations and take a more outcomes-focused approach.

Timelines for implementation and additional steps for the LSB

Q6a. Do you agree our proposed timelines for implementation are achievable?

Q6b. Are there any reasons why a regulator would not be able to meet these milestones? Please explain your answer.

Additional Q6c. Do you have views on whether and how the LSB could take additional steps to support compliance with the proposed statement of policy (e.g.,

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

through either formal or informal outputs, such as guidance and/or other relevant resources)?

46. We have no objection in principle to the implementation timeline but would highlight that the practicalities of this may depend on when the final policy statement is published. We would welcome flexibility in areas where further work is required or where the expectations would involve us consulting with the profession about any rule changes.
47. We would suggest that it may be helpful and effective to have a single set of core outcomes-focused expectations for legal regulators, with supporting guidance.

Potential impacts

Q7a. Have you identified any equality impacts (both positive and negative), we haven't considered which, in your view, may arise from our proposed statement of policy?

Q7b. Do you have any evidence relating to the potential impact of our proposals on specific groups with certain protected characteristics, and any associated mitigating measures that you think we should consider?

Q7c. Are there any other wider equality issues or impacts that we should take into account and/or any further interventions we should take to address these in our proposed statement of policy?

Q8. Do you have any comments on the potential impact of the draft statement of policy, including the likely costs and anticipated benefits?

48. Some of the expectations are likely to involve us introducing additional requirements on our regulated population. We refer in particular to requirement VII under Outcome 4. We would suggest there is likely to be a cost and regulatory burden, in particular on medium and small sized law firms, although this should be verified through engagement with law firms and a regulatory impact assessment. Our data suggests that sole practice and small firms are more likely to be run by Black, Asian and minority ethnic solicitors. Therefore, the burden of such measures may disproportionately negatively impact this group.

Further measures and additional steps for the LSB

Q9a. Do you have any comments on how the LSB, either independently and/or in partnership, might develop further measures alongside the proposals set out in the consultation to encourage a diverse profession?

SRA Consultation Response: Encouraging a diverse legal profession - the LSB's proposed statement of policy

Q9b. Do you have any views on whether the LSB could take additional steps alongside setting expectations for regulators in the draft statement of policy to encourage a diverse profession? If yes, please share your reflections on the most appropriate and potentially effective routes the LSB could take to achieve this.

Q9c. Do you have any further comments on our proposals that you would like to share?

49. We value the insight we gain from collaborating closely with other frontline legal regulators and the LSB through the Legal Regulators EDI Forum and other joint initiatives. This is helpful and can be a useful way to support each other to find solutions which encourage diversity and inclusion in the sector.
50. We would also suggest that the LSB may wish to collaborate with the Department for Business and Trade, the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, the Office for Equality and Opportunity, industry bodies such as the Law Society, regional Law Societies, the Sole Practitioners Group, the City of London Law Society and wider business representative bodies, such as the Federation of Small Businesses and the Confederation of British Industry, in exploring its proposals for mandating new equality requirements for all legal firms.

Contact details

Submitted by Aileen Armstrong, Executive Director Strategy, Innovation and External Affairs, on behalf of the SRA. Aileen.Armstrong@sra.org.uk.